

REMARKS

The Office Action of May 5, 2006 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-34, 46 and 47 are pending in this application. Claims 1-18, 21-24, 27-34, 46 and 47 stand rejected. Claims 19 and 20 are objected to and claims 24 and 25 are indicated as allowable. Through this Response and Amendment, the Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 17, 20, 22-23, and 47 and canceled claims 13, 19, 24 and 27-46. New claims 48-53 have been added, however, no new matter has been introduced. As explained in more detail below, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully solicit such action.

Interview Summary

This Interview Summary is filed further to the Examiner's Interview conducted on April 19, 2006 and the Examiner's Summary mailed May 5, 2006.

The patent owners' representatives wish to thank Examiner Le for the telephone interview on April 19, 2006, during which the pending Office Action was discussed. It was agreed that a new Office Action would be mailed due to deficiencies in the pending Office Action, including missing rejections for claims 4, 18, and 21. The patent owners' representatives appreciate the time Examiner Le spent discussing the Office Action and issuing a new Action.

Claim Objections

The Examiner indicates that claims 19 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Through this Response and Amendment, the subject matter of claims 13 and 19 has been incorporated into claim 1. Claim 20 has been amended to properly depend from claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Office Action asserts claims 22-24 relate to computer programs that are dependent upon a method claim. Through this Response and Amendment, the Applicants have amended claim 22 to more clearly recite a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for supporting a geographical-based service for at least one terminal node in a communications system. Claim 22 therefore is independent and does not depend from a method claim. Claim 23 has been amended to depend from claim 22. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14-17, 21, 27, 29, 31, 33 stand rejected under 35 USC Section 102(a) as being anticipated by Shahrier (US 2002/0154638). The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the Remarks below.

Through this Response and Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter indicated by the Examiner to be allowable (the subject matter of claims 13 and 19). Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in regards to claim 1 and dependent claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-10, 14-17 and 21. Claims 27, 29, 31 and 33 have been canceled. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shahrier. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the Remarks below.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. As indicated above, claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter indicated by the Examiner to be allowable, therefore the Applicants submit claim

7 contains allowable subject matter and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shahrier in view of Nakasugawar (US 20040004967). The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the Remarks below.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1. As indicated above, claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter indicated by the Examiner to be allowable, and claim 11 and 12 further depend from claim 10. In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit claims 10-12 contain allowable subject matter and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 13, 28, 30, 34 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shahrier in view of Nakasugawar (US 20040004967) and Aggawal (US 2004/0221154). The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the Remarks below.

Through this Response and Amendment, claims 13, 28, 30, and 34 have been canceled to expedite allowance of subject matter indicated to be allowable. The Applicants, however, retain the right or pursue the subject matter of claims 13, 28, 30, and 34, along with the subject matter of other canceled claims in other applications. In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 4, 18, 28, 46, 47 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharier in view of Nakasugawar (US 20040004967) and Brown (US 6,157,621).

Claims 4, 18 and 47 ultimately depend from claim 1. As indicated above, claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter indicated by the Examiner to be allowable, therefore the Applicants submit claims 4, 18, and 47 contains allowable subject matter. Claims 28 and 46 have been canceled to expedite allowance of subject matter indicated to be allowable. The Applicants, however, retain the right or pursue the subject matter of claims 28 and 46, along with

the subject matter of other canceled claims in other applications. In view of the foregoing, the Applicants and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

New Claims 48-53

As indicated above and reflected in the Office Action, claim 25 recites allowable subject matter. New claims 48-53, which depend from claim 25, relate to acquiring the geographical position by the terminal node. The Specification is replete with examples providing support for the new claims.

CONCLUSION

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: June 27, 2006

By:



Shawn P. Gorman
Reg. No. 56,197
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001